abnormally low, that is, under 105 to 100. Where both parents were foreign born, the proportion of males was abnormally high, often 108 to 100; while, for so-called mixed marriages, the proportion of males was higher still. The statistical basis was, however, too narrow to warrant any conclusion. Only one other explanation for the general phenomenon occurs to me, which I suggest not so much for its plausibility as to render the catalogue of explanations more complete. It is sociological in character. May not the relatively greater coherence of the family as a social unit in the country lead to greater persistence in child-bearing in the hope of securing a male heir? City families may be more content to let issue rest with the birth of one or more girls; while a country family, especially in agricultural districts, will continue fruitful until a boy arrives. Such persistence would evidently produce a greater excess of males as a natural result.

WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE AUSTRALIAN TARIFF: A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

In the article upon the Australian Tariff in the August (1908) issue of this Journal (vol. xxii. p. 591) there is reference to a case pending to test the constitutionality of the Excise Tariff Act of 1906, which involved a fundamental principle of the New Protection. On June 20 the Federal High Court, in a decision supported by the chief justice and two of his four associates, declared the law unconstitutional for four reasons, the most important of which was that it usurped the right of each state to regulate labor conditions within its own borders. This decision was followed, August 5, by another, declaring invalid a section of the trade-mark law giving trade unions a property right in a union label. These two decisions considerably restrict the power of the central Parliament to pass labor laws by

indirection. In case of the excise regulations the Government has indicated its intention to apply for an amendment to the constitution, and Mr. Reid, the leader of the Opposition, who is a free-trader, is reported to have given his support to this proposal.

On the other hand, the High Court gave a decision against New South Wales in the wire-netting case mentioned in the same article (p. 600).

VICTOR S. CLARK.

THE CLEVELAND REFERENDUM ON STREET RAILWAYS.[1]

On October 22 the people of Cleveland voted by 38,249 to 37,644—a majority of 605—to reject the franchise given by the Council as a security grant to the Cleveland Railway Company on April 27. At this writing some defects or mistakes in the use of voting machines in the sixty precincts where they were used may lead to throwing out some precincts or may otherwise change the result, but this is not likely.

The space at hand permits only a brief summary of the causes and of the possible consequences of this vote. The events leading up to the election, whose outcome surprised friends and opponents alike, were these:—

(1) The strike in May left great bitterness among a minority, but a very active minority, of the trade-unions of the city. A thousand striking conductors and motormen, who refused the chance to go back to work until after their places had been filled, devoted all their time, under pay, apparently, of some interested parties, in printing literature and actively canvassing against the Traction Company.

(2) Not as many cars were run by about fifteen per cent. as during the corresponding months of last year by the old company. The Traction Company thereby was able to

[1] See the article on the Street Railway Settlement in Cleveland, in this Journal for August, 1908.